Divine Dialectical Asymptoticism: A Philosphical Treatise

"Rather than Sisyphus endlessly pushing a boulder up a mountain with a fixed peak, he would be far more happier knowing that there is no final limit—only continuous ascent shaped by his own choices. The peak will never trap him, nor will he regress;
he moves forward, forever growing, ever been better, ever been higher."
Servideus Weissman von Yavaria

1. Introduction & Justification

Divine Dialectical Asymptoticism (*DDA*) —or Divine Asymptoticism, is a philosophical framework synthesizing critical theory, Islamic Sufistic metaphysics, and secular thought of dialectical reasoning. It seeks to resolve the limitations of purely materialist or theological models by proposing structured incompleteness—an asymptotic movement toward *the Reference*. Unlike deterministic or relativistic models, *DDA* allows for dynamic progression through history, integrating human agency and divine occasionalism.

Key influences include:

- **Neoplatonic Emanation**: Reality is structured hierarchically, with higher truths emanating downward.
- **Islamic Thought**: Al-Ghazālī's critique of necessary emanation informs *DDA*'s rejection of rigid determinism and necessary flux of influence of Neo-Platonism. He also critiqued the works of closed Islamic metaphysical philosophy, arguing that mortal cannot fully comprehend the Divine, reinforcing *DDA's* limits on human's knowledge. The Mystical side of this model also heavily influenced by al-Junayd, al-Ghazali, and Ibn Arabi.
- **Lacanian Not-All**: No symbolic system fully encapsulates reality, reinforcing *DDA*'s structured incompleteness.
- **Žižekian Ideology Critique**: Political and ideological systems claim totality but are structured around inherent contradictions.

By integrating these perspectives, *DDA* provides a dialectical model where ethical and epistemological development occurs asymptotically.

"*We cannot claim finality but are entrusted with the responsibility to strive asymptotically toward justice, even knowing we will never fully reach it. Precisely because limitations and problems itself are inherent within this system, there exists infinite space for growth, by God's will, granting humanity the freedom to choose between progress or regression indefinitely*."

2. Ontology: The Nature of Reality

2.1. Structured Incompleteness & Not-All

Reality is neither a closed system nor an arbitrary flux. Instead, it consists of structured incompleteness. The *Not-All* ensures that no ideology, science, or theological doctrine can fully encapsulate *the Reference*, yet asymptotic movement toward it or away from it remains possible.

To prove that, first, we need to explain what is Not-All, and how it relates to Structured Incompleteness? And What even is Structured Incompleteness?

We take the concept of Not-All (*pas-tout)* from Lacanian Psycho-Analysis[1], where he was influenced by mathematical logic, particularly Gödel's incompleteness theorem, which proves that no formal system can be both complete and consistent—there are always truths that escape formal proof. He applies this logic to human understanding, showing that no symbolic system (language, ideology, law, or even knowledge itself) can fully account for reality. He challenges the idea of a fully defined universal set. Lacan develops this idea within his formulas of sexuation, particularly to describe the feminine position, which does not conform to the universal logic of the phallic function.

In classical Aristotelian logic, universality is determined by whether a statement applies to "all" members of a category. However, **Lacan's "Not-all" suggests that the set of all women does not exist as a complete, totalized whole**. This is because the **feminine position escapes full symbolic determination**, implying an open-ended, structurally incomplete field. Instead of saying "all women are X," Lacan's **Not-all** means "there is no universal category that fully determines all women."

[1] Jacques Lacan, 'The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book XX: Encore: 1972-1973.', 2011.

He particularly criticized the idea of Aristotelian concept of Universal, in which it is determined whether a statement applies to ‘all’ member of a category.

1. The masculine position (Phallic Function) operates under the logic of totalization: it tries to fit everything within the symbolic order, governed by the phallic function (meaning, law, identity).
2. The feminine position, however, is "Not-All" (pas-tout)—not fully enclosed by the phallic function, meaning that it remains open to something beyond, an excess that escapes totalization.

Now let’s see this on principle. We would then examine the thought experiment of Münchhausen trilemma to demonstrate theoretical impossibility of proving any truth, even in the fields of logic and mathematics, without appealing to accepted assumptions. If it is asked how any given proposition is known to be true, proof in support of that proposition may be provided. Yet that same question can be asked of that supporting proof, and any subsequent supporting proof. The Münchhausen (or Agrippean)[2] trilemma is that there are only three ways of completing a proof. Suppose one may ask:’*what is an apple?’.* Then, you would be provided with only three different ways to answer it:

1. Suppose you would argue that: ‘*an apple is a fruit that is red’*. But the skeptic who asked then would question: ‘*why an apple must be a fruit and is red? how about a green apple?*’. Then, you would be challenged to answer it again: ‘*so yes, an apple can be green. An Apple is a fruid because we can eat it and it grows on nature*.’. then, the skeptics will come with another question of why that is, and you would then be challenged to respond again, and again, and again…. —it would then become a barrage of never-ending regression of why something is. Then, by the rule of logic, its truth cannot be claimed.
2. Suppose then you would say that:’*an apple Is an apple because I Said So. Why? Because it is an apple!’* then, if you think it would suffice then it means that your preposition itself is as valid as someone who would say ‘*an apple is a durian that has lost its spikes and turns red because of my blood and are harmful to eat’.* By this, a circular argument then wouldn’t suffice to claims the truth.

[2] Paul W. Franks, *All Or Nothing: Systematicity, Transcendental Arguments, and Skepticism in German Idealism* (Harvard University Press, 2005). Pg. 17-18.

3. Then you would remain with an answer that's dogmatic, that is: '*It is an apple, not because I know that it is an apple, but because I believe that it is apple. It must be something, but I wouldn't know'.* Then, the skeptics then would leave, unsatisfied with the answer that you had provided.

One had failed to answer the question until they manage to answer the why-question in a way that falls into none of the three options. Unless that happens, there is no reason to assume that they have given any justification whatsoever, and indeed there Is no reason to assume that any justification whatsoever is available.

Let's see an example on how this would work in another situation. A king has decided that everyone would be a subject to his rule (**∀x Φx**: "All things are subject to his law"). But there is an exception of that, that is, the King who had decided the rule himself (**∃x ¬Φx**: "There exists an exception. The king who's above the law). But then this would create a problem, that is: '*who decides that That king should be an exception? And then who decided that That rule that the king should be an exception? And who decided……'* towards infinite regression. Then it must be the case that it cannot be a completely external rule that's never ending and results in infinite regression. Is this mean the King claims that based on his own word? '*I am the King because I Said so'*? Then that rule itself is as valid as his serf who can said '*I am the king instead of Him who sits on the throne'*. Thus, the system, by its inherent structure itself, is incomplete: it is always has an excess that cannot be resolved, but somehow allowing the system to exist in the first place. This is the feminine position that's always lacking. This is the Lack that is mentioned. A system cannot be a a total binary, i.e. Between this and that thing; A rule with a subject that's an exception to that rule. It cannot be, because otherwise, it would fall down. It must always have an excess for it to exist in the first place, not in a binary system but transcend it. (**Notall x Φx:** The System points Beyond itself)

Now that we had defined what is a Not-All, we can recognize that Every System there is, must be Incomplete. Because its own existence cannot derive its justification from external means, and also from the internal means. A Kingdom cannot claim that it is already perfect and complete, because then there would be a question of: Who decided that That kingdom can claim that it is already complete? If it then would be answered that the justification comes from external (e.g. God or Power), then the question would occurs again: '*What does determine those entity to make a rule like*

that, and then so on, and so on; and if the answer to the first question is because '*I Said So'* or something similar, then it would be the case that it doesn't mean anything. King's serf then able to, for example, to claim that "*The Kingdom is Flawed*" and it would still be as valid as the first claim that the Kingdom is perfect. This is a structured Incompleteness that permeates in all system of language and reason itself, and therefore, also into Politics and Government, and even on the case of individual. There's an inherent need for something to fill that Lack, yet it remains unknowable for them because the Real, something would fill that gap, is in itself beyond logics and human reason.

2.2 The Lack

In Lacanian terms, the Lack is the fundamental condition of human existence. It's not simply the absence of something but is tied to the structure of desire and the formation of the subject. Here's a breakdown:

1. **The Mirror Stage**
   One of Lacan's most famous concepts, the Mirror Stage, refers to the moment when an infant first recognizes themselves in a mirror. Before this, they experience themselves as a fragmented body, without a clear sense of a whole self. When they recognize their reflection, they begin to form an image of the *I* (the ego), and thus an idealized sense of self emerges. However, this image is always an illusion because it's an external reflection, not a true internal sense of self. The Mirror Stage marks the beginning of our identification with our image and sets the foundation for the ego's development, but it's also the beginning of *alienation*—since this self-image is never fully aligned with our internal reality.

2. **The Real, the Imaginary, and the Symbolic**
   These are Lacan's three realms of human experience:

   - **The Imaginary**: The realm of images, illusions, and the ego. It's the world of identification, like how we see ourselves in the mirror or how we relate to our own image.

   - **The Symbolic**: This is the realm of language, culture, social norms, law, and structure. It's the world we enter when we learn language, which helps us fit into society but also limits our freedom. The Symbolic is tied to the "big Other," which can be

understood as a representation of social order or even the unconscious rules of language and communication.

- **The Real**: The most elusive of Lacan’s three registers, the Real represents what’s beyond language and impossible to symbolize. It’s not reality in a straightforward sense but rather what cannot be captured by the Imaginary or the Symbolic—things like trauma, desire, and death. The Real often appears in moments when we encounter something unexplainable or disruptive in our experience. The Divine, is to be seen as one of the Real, the Ultimate Reality that is unexplainable to human.

3. **The Big Other**
   The Big Other is a Lacanian term for the external authority or system that structures our lives. It’s not a specific person, but a kind of symbolic presence—like the law, society, or language itself—that guides our behavior and shapes our subjectivity. It's also the figure we imagine to be "watching" us or judging us, which creates the tension between individual desires and social expectations.

4. **The Name-of-the-Father**
   This concept refers to the role that the paternal function plays in structuring subjectivity. It's not necessarily the literal father but a symbolic function tied to the law and authority. In Lacanian terms, the "Name-of-the-Father" helps the child navigate the transition from the Imaginary realm (where everything is centered on the mother or primary caregiver) into the Symbolic realm (where the child is subject to social laws and structures). The Name-of-the-Father is also about the prohibition of incest and the introduction of the child into a broader social and cultural order.

5. **The Not-All**
   This concept is tied to Lacan’s idea that knowledge is never complete. There is always something missing, always a limit to what can be understood or symbolized. The "Not-All" refers to the fact that no human system—be it political, social, or ideological—can ever encompass the totality of existence. There will always be something that escapes, a space of the unknown or unrepresented. This creates the conditions for our desire, as we seek to fill that gap or lack, even though it can never be fully closed.

6. **Desire and Lack**
   Desire plays a central role in Lacanian theory. For Lacan, desire is always driven by a fundamental lack. We are born into a state of lack or incompleteness—since the ideal image we have of ourselves (as in the Mirror Stage) is never fully realized. The search for fulfillment or satisfaction is always an attempt to fill this lack, but it's a search that can never truly be completed. We pursue desires that are shaped by the Symbolic order, yet we can never fully reach them. This is why Lacan talks about desire as something that's never satisfied, but constantly shaping our identity and actions.

7. **Object Petit a**

   Object Petit a (French for "object small a") is a concept referring to the unattainable object of desire. It represents the lack or void around which human desire is structured. Lacan introduced this term to explain why human beings are never fully satisfied; desire is not about obtaining a specific object, but rather about the pursuit itself to fills the gap of existence. The more will be discussed on section 3.

8. **Jouissance**
   Jouissance is a complex and often misunderstood concept in Lacanian theory. It's often translated as "enjoyment" or "pleasure," but it's not just any pleasure—it's a form of excessive, transgressive pleasure that often goes beyond the limits of the law or social norms. Jouissance is closely related to pain, frustration, or suffering—it's pleasure with a twist of discomfort. In a sense, jouissance is bound up with desire and the quest to transgress the limits of what's possible or socially acceptable. That is because the means of properly satisfy the desires completely are lacking, and therefore the excess desire manifest into transgression; which sometimes it even causes guilt and pain when pursuing it. A guilty pleasure that cannot be explained; or it would manifest into something else. In which case we should discussed it bellow.

In Lacanian psychoanalysis, the emphasis is often on the unconscious, which operates through these symbolic structures and lacks that shape who we are. Lacan's theory suggests that subjectivity itself is structured by these interactions between the Imaginary, Symbolic, and Real, and that we are constantly navigating this tension, aware of our desire but never fully able to satisfy it. It's a dynamic process where knowledge and meaning are always incomplete, leaving us with a constant sense of alienation and

longing. The writer will take an emphasize on the concept of Jouissance, in regards to Sufism and the experience of the Real from self-annihilation in Section 3.

2.3. The Divine, The Reference, and the Ruler

- The Divine's Revelation

  After we had recognized what a Lack is, and what is a Structure Incompleteness that is inherent within human itself, we then move to prove the nature of the Divine's Revelation. Let's take a look again at the Not-All argument; it states that a system cannot be a binary and closed; there must be something that is incomplete in Human system, and provide the existence of the system in the first place.

  We will now, tries to prove that Divine's Revelation exist on both of the world; both Transcendent, and Immanent; Both in it rule, and outside the rule; that There's nothing like him in this sense, and why Reason and symbol (binary) cannot comprehend God. This aligns with the likes of Sufism, particularly Ibn Arabi and al-Ghazali.

  Let's get back to the argument of the King. He may reason that:

  'the Divine has chosen me as your King, so all the subject must obey the King's law; in exception the King himself.'

  Then the question would be that: 'Why? Is there a reason why God chooses you? Is that required for him to choose you?' Then the king would have to answer that. If he somehow answer with something along the line of:

  'well, I am Rich; I am Strong; I have good Personalities'

  Then the question results will be: 'well, are you implying that God are subject to that? Then does that mean God must chooses someone based on their Wealth and Strong? What decide that God must chooses based on those? Are there any other God higher that He is? If that's the case then who is the even higher God from that? And so on, and so on.' Then, it would result in an infinite amount of never-ending question that would never have an end point. This is contradicting the law of reasoning itself, as there cannot be the case that That claim is correct when it itself is based on an infinite regression.

  An other possibilities then, would be:

  'well, I Am the God.'

Then the question would be that: ‘So Truth is arbitrary? No inherent meaning of eternal Justice like what you had claimed? You claim that your truth is eternal yet if it changes according to your whims, then it is not an eternal in a sense, because it can change across history by your whims.’ In this case, the truth that is claimed by someone inside the system will be inherently flawed, as it will be as valid as his subject that will claim that ‘The Truth is that you are not a God’. This would mean it contradicts the very nature of its claim, that his truth is eternal, and that it is universal and applicable to all history; because there would be no meaning in one way or the other.

Thus, how can we resolve this? The writer would argue then, since God’s nature is that He cannot be comprehended by Human Reason or fully known with it; and Human will always find himself lacking to comprehend God; it is as if God resides inside the excess of the system. He is both Beyond, Transcendent to the system; but closer and inside the system at the same time; Emanating his influence to supports the system by his will, while also exist inside the system itself as an excess by his will also. As paradoxical as it is, it works because God is inherently paradoxical: meaning that God, as the creator or the system of Logic, must transcend that logic itself to exert His influence.

Bellows is the few ayah that’s state His Transcendence:

“*Say that He is God, The One; One who is in need of none and of Whom all are in need; Neither begot any not was He begotten;* ***and none is comparable to Him****.’*
QS: 112

“*And whoever strives ‘in Allah’s cause’, only does so for their own good.* ***Surely Allah is not in need of ‘any of’ his creation****”*
QS: 29:6

Bellows is the few ayah that’s state His Immanence:

*"Indeed, 'it is' We 'Who' created humankind and 'fully' know what their souls whisper to them, and **We are closer to them than 'their' jugular vein**."*
QS: 50:16

"And to Allah belongs the east and the west. So wherever you [might] turn, there is the Face of Allah. Indeed, Allah is all-Encompassing and Knowing."
QS: 2:115

In this regard, God is beyond logic; both manifest and hiDDAn; or not even both at the same time; both within and beyond the system. His law is eternal, but it's unfolding in an open-ended process. Because else, if God is purely transcendent, it would mean that the Law of God is completely detached from reality itself; making revelation, ethics, and human understanding impossible. If God were purely immanent, the divine authority would be entirely absorbed into human interpretation, making it indistinguishable from Subjective Experience.
S

- the Reference as the Will of God

  Now that we proved how God are both Transcendence and Immanent, we can say that it is makes sense now, that the Divine would be necessarily both Transcendence and Immanent; That is because, if God is purely transcendent, it would also implied that the Law of God is completely detached from reality itself; making revelation, ethics, and human understanding impossible. Else, if God were purely immanent, the divine authority would be entirely absorbed into human interpretation, making it indistinguishable from Subjective Experience. Then, we will now focus on how the Divine would manifest into reality and interact with it, with also being transcendent and immanent.

God has Revealed a law, and that is, for the writer himself: it is a Quran; and he also sent his prophet and mystics to guide human in their progression of ethics and knowledge. But we will particularly concerned with the nature of Quran, or in this case, the **Divine Reference Point**.

So what is a Divine Reference Point? It defined as: an Universal guides or Reference, that would decide the proximity of an organism in its alignment to the Divine. It would function as an unreachable metaphysical ruler that judge whether an entity (e.g. individual or society) is more stable and Just than the other. It functions as the mediating structure; it is the point where the transcendent becomes immanent without collapsing into either extreme. It is not God in itself, but it is also not entirely separate from God (the Quran is Kalamullah and it is Qadim). It is the structured Reference point that allows divine authority to interact with the world.

One Interpretation would be that the Reference are inside the Masculine Universal+Exception Structure; or that it operates under the logic of totalization: it tries to fit everything within the symbolic order, governed by the phallic function (e.g. language, meaning, symbol, etc). This would mean that the Reference serves as fully-closed structure that take exception in itself to grounds divine authority in a way that's remains transcendent while also accessible to humans. It is a necessary external reference that allows divine law to exist within this system without harming its inherent trait of transcendence by His Will. It is Eternal and Universal (transcendence) that it is remains relevant across all history, yet also revealed in history of human progress (immanent). It acts as a Reference Point for human to decide whether this is ethical or not; or whether an organism[3] gets closer to God's will or regressing. Another example would be Prophethood; that in itself as a human, he is an Immanent, but he also receives Divine knowledge from beyond human limitations (transcendent).

[3] The reason the writer put an organism instead of subject: is that the writer want to show that most of these framework can be applied to an individual and a system or state. So, the word 'organism' here is to show, that this is relevant to both of those existence.

However, this would create the same problem as stated above:

‘If the Reference is an external reference that decided all things and structure the Divine Law as a fully-closed structures, that requires no further interpretation because it is already perfect for symbolic Human comprehension of it, then who or what determines it?’

- If The the Reference is arbitrarily chosen, then it would mean that Divine Authority is unstable and not universal.
- If the Reference is necessary, then something external must determine it; leading to infinite regress.

This means that the Reference itself must contain an internal contradiction because it exists in the realm of symbol; and that is false. It must be the case that it is both necessary and open-ended.

It then would mean there is a second interpretation, that is: the Reference must position itself in the Feminine Not-All Structure. the Reference cannot be fully closed structure because Divine Law itself cannot fully enclose divine reality.

Instead, the Reference must have an excess that ensures it remains incomplete, open-ended, and unfolding; that is, the Reference are already complete in itself, but needs progress for it to be revealed to Human. The ‘God’ and ‘the Idea of God’ are separate things, while ‘God’ are the full truth, human idea of God itself would never be complete, but can be strive towards. This means that prophethood, revelation, and divine guidance are not static; they are structured yet always exceeding their own boundaries.

The Quran is ‘complete’, but it leaves room for continuous interpretation. Prophet Mohammed PBUH is the “Seal” of prophethood, but mysticism and divine still shaping and drive the human alongside the divine reality. Ethical progress and historical change shows that Divine Law is not a fixed totality, but a dialectical unfolding.

Now, let’s try using Lacan’s logic of the Universal and Exception vs. the Notall, we can categorize theological views of the Reference into two structures:

1. Masculine Structure (Universal + Exception):

- the Reference is a total system that contains divine law and guidance (∀x Φx: "All things are subject to divine revelation").

- However, God as the revealer is outside this system, standing as an exception that determines it but is not contained by it (∃x ¬Φx: "There exists an exception, the One who is beyond the law itself").

- This supports the Ash‘arite claim that the Reference (e.g. Qur’an) is uncreated, as it exists eternally with God.

2. Feminine Structure (Notall):

- The the Reference is not all of divine speech; it is a manifestation of a larger, infinite divine knowledge (Notall x Φx).

- The the Reference reveals, but also points beyond itself, implying that divine reality exceeds textual expression.

- This supports the Mu‘tazilite claim that the Reference is created because its historical revelation is contingent and finite.

“*If all the trees on earth were pens and the ocean [were ink], refilled by seven other oceans, the Words of Allah would not be exhausted. Surely Allah is Almighty, All-Wise.*”
QS. 31:27

Closed systems claim total possession of truth and lead to stagnation. Pure open-ended systems risk relativism and chaos. We then unite both—truth exists, but human engagement with it is always an unfolding journey. Thus, the Reference is both Structured and Incomplete; it is a fixed reference point that is always points beyond itself. Revelation is fixed, but its realization is dialectical. Justice is eternal, but its application is historical. The human progress towards Divine Order would never be complete or that they’ll ever arrive; but

they can always strive towards it asymptotically. Thus, the room for growth is infinite, leaving human with a choice between progress, stagnation, or even regress.

- Directionality of Struggles

  Since the Reference is the Real, an excess within the system that can never be fully fulfilled; It will always remain in the Feminine position (Not-All), meaning it is never fully totalized. This is why divine truth is eternal, yet human can strive inside of it. But then the question remains, if the Reference is an unconceivable light or guidance, then how can one know whether they progress towards or regress away from? If the Reference (the Divine Word) is eternal, then is should be fully present at all times; unchanging and absolute. But if we can get closer or further away from it, that means there is a difference in our relationship with it over time. This would suggest that divine truth is not simply ‘there’ in a fixed way; rather, it has an emanative power structure. Are they changed in position or something similar?

  The answer would be that, the Divine Word itself does not change, but our capacity to perceive, engage, and embody it does. We then introduce a two concept, between the Reference and the Ruler. While a Reference is divine; a Ruler is human an approximation of the Reference.

  This means that the Truth is not just static object, but an unfolding relationship; one that involves distances and proximity; not a spatial one but ontological one. This is exactly what emanation explains; the more further something is away from the source, the less “Real” it becomes.

  Let’s see an example. A concept of Justice is always a relevant topic across human history. The concept of Justice is also stated in the Reference, or in this example, the Qur’an. One should strive towards it, it says. After that, one would maybe for example, suggests that ‘Justice means that everyone receives the same treatment’; then, it dialectically challenged by other person who’ll say that ‘Justice means everyone receive a different treatment according to their vice or wisdom’, but everything can be approximated because that justice itself Is a thing, and we reference those when we invoke it. Sure, all of them would leave some kind of ‘oppression’ and discrimination, but one of them should be closer to the Reference rather than not. This is the Law of Excluded Middle in logic; now, let’s say in this example,

the latter wins by stating ‘different justice for different situation, not the same treatment for everyone’. They would be closer because, there’ll be less oppression; although still exists in one way or another, but they definitely progress towards the Divine Justice, as smallest as it is. It would result in more stability of a system than the first concept of ‘same treatment’. The Latter has fewer contradiction and problems within its system, while the First has more of it. This, ‘human sense’ (for a lack of a better word), of less contradiction is corelated by its proximity towards Divine Justice. The more just a system is, the closer it is towards the Reference. The sign of it is: how many contradictions it has in its system; and how the system addresses their Lack compared to any other system? This is an approximation of the proximity of a system in regard to the Reference.

- the Reference is the metaphysical sun from which all being derives light

  the Reference is absolute Real, it is eternal and unchanging. However, emanation means that creation exist at varying ‘distance’ from the Real. This ‘distance’, is not spatial but ontological; Things further from the Real have less of its presence.

  A metaphor would be that, a Sun emanates light; there is no break between the sun and its rays. But the further you are from the sun, the less heat and light you would experience. The sun itself is always shining, but your experience of it changes based on your position. Similarly, the Divine Word is always eternal, but human perception, ethics, and knowledge of it can be closer or further away. We do experience movement towards or away from the Reference, in terms of ethical, epistemic, existential, and spiritual shift; but it is not a fixed object, but rather, an Universal Reference that’s incomprehensible in its totality, but still can be approximated. We can always make and refines a better Ruler; an approximation of it, but we will never arrive at it in finality. the Reference is not a point inside the system, but it is an excess, something both beyond and within the structure.

  It would be said then, why distance from the Reference creates corruption? The best theory the writer had is, that if something is further away from the Real, it lacks divine presence. This Lack is what we call “evil”; not a positive and autonomous force other than goodness, but a privation, an absence of divine fullness (Maimonedes). The closer something is to the Real, the more fully it

embodies divine truth. So ‘Evilness’ in itself is not a ‘Thing’, but a degree of absence. Just like cold is the absence of heat; darkness is the absence of light; evil is the absence of divine presence. It is not an independent force, but rather a condition of being further from the emanating source. When one moves ‘closer’ to the Reference, reality becomes coherent, integrated, and aligned with divine presence, although not perfectly, but better. On the other hand, when one moves ‘away’ from the Reference, experience becomes fragmented, chaotic, and lacking in divine presence.

This can also explain why Jouissance[4] occurs more often as they regress further away from the Reference, and also the opposites; because the Lack between the Real and Ego that is still bound by its Symbol, demands satisfaction to fulfill the ever-increasing existential Gap. It cries for sustenance and fulfillment, yet the Symbolic order and/or Ego that’s regressing away from the Real prevent the availability of the means of pleasure and stability. Thus, an excess desire that’s unfulfilled results in Jouissance inside the system.

2.4. Modes of Response to the Reference

After we had explored how the Reference and the Ruler works in this framework, we now will explore how would an organism would react to the Reference. When an organism meets its own contradiction within itself in regard to the Reference, they will be provided with four limited model of responses, in which it takes place within infinite amounts of possibilities. There are four modes of human responses that is possible to take, that is:

1. **Positive Asymptotic Movement**

   Greater experiental unity; A sense of interconnectedness, transcendence, and purpose.

   This response would produce stronger system or idea in accordance with the Divine. This can be approximated with:

- Ethical and epistemic progression toward *the Reference*.
- Increased clarity of perception; truth becomes more self-evident, ethical action becomes more intuitive.
- Higher degrees of ethical responsibility; acts align with divine justice and universal good.

[4] For the definition of Jouissance included above

2. **Non-Directional Movement/Stagnation**
   Indifference toward the the Reference, leading to stagnation in spiritual and ethical development. This response would accumulate contradiction as time passes, until it reaches certain threshold that would forcibly decides whether an organism would take a positive or negative asymptotic direction. This is the most common response, as progress wouldn't be a constant rate, but incremental one. As Synthesis occurs, progress will drive an organism, before they'll stagnate as contradiction accumulates again once more, creating a cyclical motion between Positive, Stagnation, and Negative movement of progress.
   Indication: Accumulation of contradiction, forcing eventual transition.
3. **Negative Asymptotic Movement**
   A continuous movement away from the Reference, rejecting it outright, leading to moral and existential disintegration. This response would produce the weakest system or idea compared to all responses.
   Indication:

- Ethical and epistemic degradation.
- Confusion; Fragmentation; Lack of Meaning
- Ethical degeneration; reality becomes more self-centered, disconnected, or oppressive.

  A sense of existential alienation; the loss of sacred, nihilism, or lack of coherence.

4. **Fanā' (Mystical Annihilation)**
   The dissolution of the self into divine presence, representing the ultimate mystical union with God. This response would produce stronger system or idea, limited only to oneself; as it is impossible for an experience of fullness or full divine to be formulated into a language or any rational attempt. It is coming from an the Divine itself, rather than continuous approach while retaining ego (e.g. identity, agency) of an individual. This mode, is purely individual but can grant insight into the the Reference; but they cannot impose knowledge as the Reference itself are asymbolic; where human languages are symbolic. This is why a mortal system cannot be perfect, but can only asymptotically develops towards it; or annihilates his own ego (nafs) to experience the Divine fully, and fulfill the gaps the Lack.
   Indication: Total loss of self into the divine, yielding insight but no systematic knowledge.

2.4. Implication of Every Possible Choices

From these responses, one could argue that the closer an organism or system towards the Reference is, the better; While the opposite is not. Better system strives while the weaker one falters. the Reference determines whether a system is more stable or not, by looking at its proximity towards it. This is why progress is regarded as better, as it provides more stability of a system rather than regress or Stagnation.

Regression or further distance to the Reference would make a system weaker, as it will destabilize its subject. It will do so in its accumulation of Contradiction within the system. It will also result in increasing rate of Jouissance within a system. When Progress happens, the rate of which Jouissance will occur are weaker but never gone, while also the Opposites; that is, when contradiction within a system will accumulate without a clear resolution, the rate of occurrence will be heightened.

An Example of this would be a corrupt leadership. In an attempt to ‘ignore’ the contradiction and problem within the system (e.g. claiming that they are already in a perfect system or with an apathetic approach, therefore we don’t need to change), they would undoubtedly result in a transgression from the system of its citizens (e.g. Stealing, Murder, Drug Abuses, self-harming act, or even political activism). This Stagnation will reach a certain threshold where the contradiction becomes too much; it forces the system to change between two possible states. Either one, the system will resolve the contradiction with being regressed further into societal decadence (e.g. totalitarianism; USSR; Late stage Roman Empire; and the Post-Rashidun Caliphate); or, the system will progress into better state than stagnation before, either with violent, or peaceful revolution. The System, also can collapse into regression, where the biggest contradiction would resolve itself into systemic collapse, whereby it’ll give space for reform possibilities (e.g. reformation of eastern Europe in Post-USSR collapse). This progress would also explain why some systems survive better than the others. This discussion about the ideologies will be discussed further in the next section.

2.5. Determinism vs Occasionalism

One may would ask: what is the nature of God himself in regards to this structure? Is it necessary that He sustain this structure of the world or reality as it is? Or is it His will that he created this structure? In then we would answer: It is by His Will that the world exists, not necessarily. That is

because, if it necessary for God to create the world, then God is a subject to something else that has determined that God has to be; it would then mean that God is inside the Masculine Position and thus we will see that God will falls in the same manner as what we had argued before. God is Incomprehensible by human standard. Thus, it should be the case that God remain in the Feminine position and occupies the excess of that system; sustaining the system transcendently by His will, but also immanently within that system by His will also. He must be beyond logic; surpassing the Binary logic itself to support that system, while also paradoxically remains within that system itself. He is not ‘outside’ the system to sustains it from external position; yet he’s also being transcendent and act as an excess inside the system itself. By His will, God Supports the system from within yet remains transcendent and without limitation in the excess of the system itself. Now, we can see that God’s ‘emanation’ is not a necessary for Him; as if, God is not a subject to something else to necessitate him to supports the system, but rather, he is the subject to himself that’s beyond.

In this regard, the existence of the system is in His Will rather than out of necessity; and that he can stop the structure of existence itself if he had willed to do so. This is aligned with al-Ghazali’s critique against Islamic Metaphysical Neo-Platonism, where the likes of Ibn Sina and Ibn Farabi see a God as if it is mechanical existence that must necessarily sustain the reality as if God were subject to something else; when in reality, it is by His Will the world occurs, and by His Will also that the world may not exist. It is by His Will also that he may emanate his influence to create and sustains the world and also meddling in the affairs of world he had created. This is where a Prophet, Sufi, Revelation, etc. would become some of His sign of His unexplainable influence within the world; that is exist within the world yet exceeding its reality in itself; carrying the universal truth in a way that is eternal and inexplainable in its totality, yet still can be used as a measure of Reference for Human progress and wisdom. A revelation that is approachable and accessible to Mortal, yet also unreachable in its fullness.

God is the only perfect and complete reality, while humanity, by divine decree, exists within a structured yet limited system. By design, human beings will never escape the truth nor they will have a full access of divine truth or reach the finality of the Divine—not due to external restriction, but because the very structure of existence prevents total closure.

Human beings will never attain divine perfection, for perfection belongs solely to God. Instead, they can only move toward or away from it asymptotically, always engaging with the divine without ever fully grasping it or runs away from it. This movement is asymptotic—an infinite

progression of partial approaches and regressions, never reaching absolute completion.

Human agency operates within the limits decreed by God’s Will, not out of necessity but by divine choice. The journey of ethical and spiritual refinement is thus not a linear progression but a dynamic, evolving process within the constraints of limited freedom—a freedom willed by God rather than dictated by external necessity.

“Everyone turns to their own direction ‘of prayer’. So compete with one another in doing good. Wherever you are, Allah will bring you all together [for judgment]. Surely Allah is Most Capable of everything.”
QS. 2:158

“And you cannot escape Him on earth or in heaven. Nor have you any protector or helper besides Allah.”
QS:. 29:22

“As for those who struggle in Our cause, We will surely guide them along Our Way. And Allah is certainly with the good-doers.”
QS. 29:69

3. Epistemology: Knowledge as Directional Awareness

3.1. Progress In Proving the Limitation of Human Knowledge

It would then be asks, why every progress will never reach a finality? Why does its asymptotic in contrast with symptotic? The question would be, that the very system or basic framework itself, in which human work with the environment around him, is inherently lacking in itself, because that human system is a closed-system, meaning, on its very structure it is contradictory in itself. The limitation arises from the fundamental limitations within the structure of human knowledge itself. Unlike a fully enclosed system that could, in principle, resolve all contradictions within it, human epistemic frameworks, the Ruler, are necessarily incomplete, lacking the capacity to fully encapsulate absolute truth. This limitation stems from the fact that any closed system of human understanding contains inherent contradictions, making totalization impossible. In this sense, progress is not merely a failure to "arrive" at truth but an intrinsic feature of human cognition, where every solution generates new contradictions, pushing thought and

knowledge toward refinement without ever achieving total closure. This idea is not just a metaphysical assertion but is supported by multiple philosophical and logical critiques of epistemic totality

In here, we will try explore in proving why would the knowledge of human will have its limitation that can never be resolved logically. We'll take an argument from al-Ghazali's critique of Philosophy; Kantian System, and Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem.

1. al-Ghazali's Critique of the Islamic Neo-Platonist regarding the Nature of God and Rationality as the highest Form of knowledge

   Al-Ghazali's critique of philosophy demonstrated that human reason alone is insufficient for reaching absolute truth, as it is bound by contingency and requires divine revelation to access what is beyond rational grasp. He starts by proving how in any sense, that the existence of knowledge beyond rationality can exist and are a must. He started by proving how flawed the 'Knowledge' is because the idea of Knowledge at his time —around the philosopher; must be rational, as rationality is the highest form or tool that drives human towards something greater. In this sense, by proving how would a knowledge beyond the rationality can exist and that rationality in Man is flawed, al-Ghazali would have a basis to attack the claim of the philosopher at his time regarding the nature of God by their rationality, particularly by Islamic Neo-Platonism. In relation to DDA, he argues that God exist in an excess of Logic; he is beyond Logic, so he argues that Logic itself would be insufficient to explains his existence and will. This is the case that, we want to avoids limiting God by inserting Him inside the system; nor we want to make Him purely transcendental so the question of how He's able to influence the world if it is, remains unanswered.

   It then may be asked, what was al-Ghazali attacks primarily in Islamic Neo-Platonist Thought? According to his late works, *al-Munkidh min al-Dholal*[5] (Deliverance from Error), his target is three propositions:

   (1) Bodies do not rise again; spirits alone will be rewarded or punished; future punishments will be therefore spiritual and not

[5] 1058-1111 Ghazzali, *The Confessions of Al Ghazzali*, ed. by L. (Launcelot) Cranmer-Byng and S. A. (Shaporji Aspaniarji) Kapadia, trans. by Claud Field, 2019 <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/58977> [accessed 8 February 2025].

physical. They are right in admitting spiritual punishments, for there will be such; but they are wrong in rejecting physical punishments, and contradicting in this manner the assertions of the Divine Law. This is already against the Religious Dogma.

(2) "God takes 'only' the cognisance of universals, not of specials." This is manifestly irreligious. The Qur'an asserts truly, "Not an atom's weight in heaven or earth can escape His knowledge" (QS. 3:43).

(3) They maintain that the universe exists from all eternity and will never end, and that is necessary. It negates God's will and power because an eternal world implies that God has no choice in creating. Who or what then, forces God to necessitate the world? The concept leads to contradictions, as an actual infinite past is impossible. Their arguments fail to provide conclusive demonstration of the impossibility of a world created in time

We will explore how al-Ghazali would refute these using Logical and Empirical refutation[6]. The preposition would be:

A. The First Cause and Simplicity of God

On the first preposition would be regarding the pure simplicity and universality of god:

> "God, as the First Cause (al-'illa al-ula), is completely simple and undivided. Any plurality in Him (such as will, power, and knowledge) is impossible.)"

al-Ghazali then argues that, If God is pure simplicity, how does He produce multiplicity? The philosophers claim that from the One only one thing can proceed. Yet, the universe is full of multiplicity —so how does it emerge? Their answer is that the First Cause produces the first intellect, which then generates a cascade of causes. Al-Ghazali exposes this as arbitrary—there is no logical necessity in why one intellect should lead to another in this scheme. The dilemma would be: If God is simple and undivided, then He cannot be the cause of a structured, complex universe. If He does cause complexity, then simplicity is lost.

[6] Michael E. Marmura, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* (Brigham Young University, 1998).

B. God’s Knowledge of Particulars

> “God only knows universals, not particulars, because knowledge of particulars would entail change in divine knowledge, which contradicts divine immutability.”

al-Ghazali then would argue that, if **God only knows universals**, then **He does not know individual human actions**. If He does not know individual actions, how can He reward or punish? Avicenna’s position requires an active intellect to bridge the gap, but al-Ghazali argues that this makes divine knowledge dependent on intermediaries, which contradicts God's absolute self-sufficiency.

C. The Problem of Causality and Necessary Connection

The philosopher then would claim that:

> “Causation is necessary: if A happens, B must follow. Fire burns cotton by necessity.”

al-Ghazali then argues that, just because event B follows event A does not mean A causes B necessarily. Observation only shows correlation, not necessary causation. If causality were necessary, then miracles (which break causal laws) would be impossible.

There’s a several cases that Causality break in this equation. (e.g., Abraham surviving the fire) does not imply logical contradiction. Since causality is not self-evident, it is possible that fire does not always burn.

D. Refutation of the Immaterial Soul and Denial of Bodily Resurrection

“The Soul is immaterial and immortal, and bodily resurrection is impossible.”

By Logic then, al-Ghazali argues that Avicenna’s proofs for an immaterial soul itself are not demonstrative. The soul’s ability to think abstractly does not prove it exists separately from the body.

By Empirical Observation, he argues that Human perception and consciousness are altered by physical changes (e.g., brain injury affects cognition). If the soul were entirely independent, why does its function depend on the body? If an immaterial soul exists, that

does not prove bodily resurrection is impossible. Both can be true at the same time. The Qur'an explicitly asserts bodily resurrection. Unless Avicenna can demonstrate bodily resurrection is impossible, his rejection is invalid.

Thus, by looking at these refutations, one could argue that:

1. There's no truth in claiming that Bodies would never be resurrected by God;
2. God Is Omniscient;
3. Either God is an external force or force within the reality; which both has problem in itself. Then, it must be the case that God is beyond what the logical constraint are, therefore, there are knowledge that exist outside of the human rationality, and that's belongs to God.

From the argument of necessary Connection then, we had known how would it takes, as we had discussed on section 2.5.

2. Immanuel Kant's Transcendental Idealism

We would then move into western philosophy, where Immanuel Kant in his Critique of Pure Reason[7] would argues that everything that we know, would never be 'a thing in itself', because the very way of how we know something, is always subjective by how our minds structure experience. He then would introduce a crucial distinction between:

(1) Phenomena — The world as we perceive it, shaped by our senses and cognitive faculties.

(2) Noumena (Thing-in-Itself) — The reality that exists independently of human perception

Kant's argument is that while we can interact with and make sense of phenomena, we can never directly access noumena, meaning we can never know things as they are in themselves.

[7] Sondra Rueter, 'The Critique of Pure Reason by Immanuel Kant: A Comprehensive Overview', *Philosophos.Org* <https://www.philosophos.org/modern-texts-the-critique-of-pure-reason-by-immanuel-kant> [accessed 8 February 2025].

A. Knowledge Is Structured by the Mind, Not a Direct Reflection of Reality

Kant rejects the idea that our minds passively receive knowledge from the world. Instead, he argues that our minds actively structure reality through built-in cognitive frameworks. We do not experience the world "as it is"—we experience it filtered through categories of perception, such as space, time, and causality.

Let’s see its argument. All knowledge depends on perception. Perception is filtered through the mind’s built-in structures (space, time, causality). Since we cannot perceive reality outside these structures, we can never access the thing-in-itself.

If we could know the thing-in-itself, we would have to experience it outside of space, time, and causality. But human cognition is always structured by space and time—we cannot "turn off" these filters. Therefore, the noumenon (thing-in-itself) is necessarily unknowable because we can only know things as they appear within our cognitive framework.

An example would be, that Human develops its ability to think in accordance with its maturity development. A baby cannot use reasoning to explains the world, but as they grow, they can use logic and reasoning. It means that, Knowledge are structured but the development of the Mind, not a Direct reflection of Reality.

B. Space and Time Are Forms of Human Perception, Not External Realities

Kant then argues that space and time are not objective properties of the external world but conditions of human perception. All our experiences occur within space and time, but we have no way of knowing whether these categories exist outside of our perception. Since all knowledge is structured by space and time, we cannot access reality beyond these limits.

Everything we see, hear, or touch exists within space and time. We have never perceived anything outside of these conditions. If something does exist beyond space and time (the noumenon), we have no sensory access to it. Since knowledge is based on experience, we cannot know anything beyond experience itself.

An example would be that: We can see visible light, but we cannot see infrared or ultraviolet without instruments. That does not mean infrared does not exist—it means our senses are limited to a specific range. Similarly, if there is a reality beyond space and time, we have no “instrument” to perceive it.

C. The Limits of Pure Reason: Why We Cannot Know Noumena

Kant also shows that when we try to think beyond the limits of perception, our reason collapses into contradictions (what he calls "antinomies"). An antinomy is when two opposing arguments are both logically valid, yet they contradict each other. Kant’s Antinomies are one of the most profound demonstrations of why human reason cannot grasp the thing-in-itself (noumenon). They show that pure reason collapses into contradictions when it tries to go beyond the limits of human perception. Kant arrives at his conclusion by analyzing 4 different Antinomies, that we will explore:

(1) The first Antinomy: the Beginning of the Universe

- Thesis (Argument for a Beginning in Time):

  The universe must have a beginning, because an infinite past is impossible—if time had no starting point, we could never arrive at the present.

- Antithesis (Argument for an Eternal Universe):

  The universe must be eternal, because something cannot come from nothing—if time had a beginning, what caused the first moment?

Contradiction: Both arguments seem correct, yet they are incompatible. Time must have a beginning, yet time cannot have a beginning. This shows that human reason collapses when trying to conceptualize absolute time.

(2) Second Antinomy: The Size of Space

- Thesis (Argument for a Finite Universe):

  Space must be finite, because an infinite universe would be impossible to traverse or comprehend.

- Antithesis (Argument for an Infinite Universe):

  Space must be infinite, because if it had a limit, there would have to be something beyond it—but that would still be part of space.

Contradiction: The universe must be finite, yet it must be infinite. Space must have a boundary, yet a boundary requires something beyond it. This shows that our concepts of space break down beyond perception.

(3) Third Antinomy: Causality and Free Will

- Thesis (Argument for Determinism):

  Everything in the universe operates under strict causality—every event is determined by prior events. Free will is impossible because all actions are determined by prior causes.

- Antithesis (Argument for Free Will):

  Not everything is determined by causality—if there is no free will, then moral responsibility makes no sense. If everything is determined, how can we hold anyone accountable for their actions?

Contradiction: Free will must exist, yet free will cannot exist. If everything is determined, free will is an illusion. But if free will is real, determinism cannot be absolute. This shows that our rational concepts of freedom vs. determinism are inherently contradictory.

(4) Fourth Antinomy: The Existence of a Necessary Being (God or a First Cause)

- Thesis (Argument for a Necessary Being):

  There must be a necessary being (e.g., God), because contingent existence requires a cause—the universe must have an ultimate foundation.

- Antithesis (Argument Against a Necessary Being):

> There cannot be a necessary being, because everything requires a cause—if God exists necessarily, why is He exempt from causation?

> Contradiction: A necessary being must exist, yet a necessary being cannot exist. The principle of causation collapses when applied to the absolute origin of things. If God is necessary, why does He not require a cause? If everything needs a cause, then God must also have a cause, which creates infinite regress. This shows that reason alone cannot answer the question of ultimate existence.

The problem is not in the answers—it is in the question itself. The contradictions show that human reason was never meant to answer these kinds of questions. The categories of thought (space, time, causality) only apply to phenomena—they break down when applied to noumena (ultimate reality).

Human reason inherently contradicts itself when trying to answer ultimate metaphysical questions. This contradiction arises because reason is trying to apply categories beyond the phenomenal world. Since reason collapses at its own limits, the noumenal (thing-in-itself) is fundamentally unknowable.

Its implication would be, There can be no rationalist "proof" of God, free will, or the ultimate nature of reality. Metaphysics must be redefined—we must distinguish between what can be known and what cannot. God cannot be fully grasped by human reason—this aligns with apophatic (negative) theology in Islam and Christianity. Al-Ghazali’s critique of philosophy aligns with Kant’s conclusion—divine truth cannot be fully contained in human reasoning.

For DDA, this implies that Truth is necessarily asymptotic—human progress never fully encloses divine knowledge. Revelation serves as a reference point, but full divine comprehension remains beyond human grasp. This proves why human systems will always have excess, contradiction, and incompleteness.

D. The Final Conclusion: Why Human Knowledge Is Always Mediated

All human knowledge is shaped by the mind's structures (space, time, causality). Since we can only experience reality through these structures, we can never know what reality is like beyond them.

Noumena (things-in-themselves) exist, but they are unknowable—we can only work with phenomena. This is why human progress in knowledge is always mediated—it is never absolute, only relative to our cognitive limitations.

3. Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

Gödel's Incompleteness theorems demonstrate that any sufficiently complex formal system cannot be both complete and consistent. He proved this by attacking one of the leading core of the Ruler: Mathematics. This insight is crucial for understanding why human knowledge, including theology, remains asymptotic rather than final.

Gödel showed in his first theorem, that in any formal system that includes arithmetic, there exists a mathematical statement (G) that asserts: "This statement is not provable within this system." If G were provable, it would contradict itself, meaning the system would be inconsistent. If G is true but unprovable, the system is incomplete. This proves that some truths will always remain beyond proof within the system itself.

In his second theorem, Gödel further proved that no formal system can prove its own consistency without creating contradictions. This means that even mathematics, the foundation of logic and reason, cannot fully justify itself from within.

Gödel assigned unique numbers to symbols, formulas, and proofs, allowing mathematics to reference itself numerically. Using this system, he created a formula (G) that refers to its own provability, leading to a paradox that mathematically proves the limitations of formal systems[8].

Gödel's theorems reinforce the idea that no human system of knowledge, including theology, can fully enclose divine truth. Just as mathematics contains truths beyond provability, divine reality transcends any formal system, including religious law and dogma. This aligns perfectly with the Qur'anic view that God's knowledge exceeds human comprehension and that revelation is structured yet open-ended.

[8] 'How Gödel's Proof Works | Quanta Magazine' <https://www.quantamagazine.org/how-godels-proof-works-20200714/?utm_source=chatgpt.com> [accessed 8 February 2025].

The Reference, as a divine revelation, operates under a similar principle: it is a structured totality that simultaneously points beyond itself. Divine truth is not fully enclosed in the text but unfolds dialectically, ensuring that theological understanding remains dynamic rather than fixed. Gödel's incompleteness theorems provide a powerful analogy for why divine knowledge, like mathematical truth, must always contain an excess that prevents total closure. This is further proved by al-Ghazali and Kant's Transcendental Idealism of the limitation of human knowledge.

3.2. Asymptotic Process Truth & Falsehood as Directional

We then would ask, What is a Knowledge? If we can't even know what a Truth is, then how come we know that something is a Knowledge? For that we define*:* Knowledge is any information—rational or irrational, empirical or divine—that enables movement along the map of the Reference, expanding choices for individuals or systems. It is not a fixed entity but a directional process, always in flux. Since absolute truth is inaccessible, knowledge exists in two forms: Human Knowledge, which is the Ruler, inherently limited and structured by human cognition, and Non-Human Knowledge or the Reference, which transcends human understanding and remains inconceivable in its fullness, though it can provide insight.

The very lack within human knowledge ensures that learning is an unending progression. There is no finality in the growth of knowledge and ethics—only the constant choice between progress, stagnation, or regression. Knowledge is neutral; its value is determined by its alignment with the Reference rather than by an intrinsic moral status. Even false or outdated knowledge, such as past scientific theories or flawed ideologies, plays a role in epistemic evolution by structuring thought and revealing contradictions.

Knowledge is drawn from three interdependent sources:

(1) Revelation – The highest reference point, providing ethical and metaphysical guidance beyond human reason. While divine truth itself is asymbolic and cannot be fully translated into human language, it can be approximated through prophecy, mystical experience, and direct revelation. Since revelation unfolds within history, its meaning is not static but dynamically interpreted over time.

(2) Rational Inquiry – The process of philosophical reasoning, dialectical critique, and logical analysis. While reason is inherently limited—unable to fully grasp the "thing-in-itself"—it serves as a tool for refining understanding and resolving contradictions. Thinkers like Al-

Ghazali and Kant demonstrate that reason, though unable to reach ultimate reality, can approximate truth by continuously interrogating its own limitations.

(3) Empirical Observation – Knowledge gained through direct experience, scientific inquiry, and historical analysis. While constrained to the material world, empiricism allows for pattern recognition and correction of errors. However, without revelation as a reference point and reason as a structuring tool, empirical knowledge risks reductionism—mistaking material reality for the whole of existence.

The progression of learning is not static but a continuous movement toward (or away from) divine truth. Even flawed knowledge plays a role in this process by exposing contradictions that propel further refinement. Knowledge, therefore, is asymptotic and incomplete—humans will never fully encapsulate divine wisdom, but they can continuously strive toward it. But since knowledge is contextual, it is access that should be regulated, not knowledge itself. It must be done so in a way that's not causing harm to its subject, as it is to propel themselves away from the Reference if not used wisely.

3.3. The Development of Knowledge: the Role of Inaccurate Knowledge

Then one may would ask, if a knowledge is every information there is, whether inaccurate, then do they serve a purpose? Like what we said before, every of the constructed information does has its value. Knowledge is not static but pragmatic and directional. Even if an idea is later proven false, it can still be justified as knowledge if it played a role in moving people closer to the more accurate representation of reality at a given time

Let's take an example. In ancient Greek, Democritus proposed that everything is made of tiny, indivisible particles (atoms). His theory was purely philosophical—no experimental evidence. He imagined atoms as tiny solid spheres with no internal structure. Then, there's Dalton revived atomism but believed atoms were indivisible and uniform. This model worked well for explaining chemical reactions but was partially wrong. Then Thomson's Model came with the Discovery of the electron led to a model where atoms were a positive "pudding" with negative electrons scattered inside. This was later proven false, but it was an important step toward modern atomic theory. Rutherford showed that atoms have a dense nucleus with electrons orbiting around it. Modern quantum mechanics

(Schrödinger, Heisenberg) proved that electrons don’t "orbit" but exist in probability clouds[9].

Each incorrect model provided insights that led to a more accurate understanding. Without Democritus, there would be no Dalton; without Dalton, no Rutherford; without Rutherford, no quantum mechanics. Even though ancient atomism is completely wrong by modern standards, it was true enough in its time to push science forward.

Let’s take another example. For centuries, many societies justified slavery based on the belief that some races were inherently inferior, less rational, or even "destined" to serve others. Philosophers like Aristotle argued that some people were "natural slaves", while Enlightenment thinkers like Locke avoided challenging slavery despite advocating human rights. Religious interpretations were also used to justify it. The contradiction between slavery and emerging ideas of universal human dignity forced societies to refine their moral systems. Abolitionists (e.g., Olaudah Equiano, Frederick Douglass) used the very religious and philosophical systems that once justified slavery to dismantle it (e.g., arguing that all humans are equal before God). The struggle over slavery led to broader discussions about human rights, democracy, and justice, influencing later movements for civil rights, labor rights, and anti-colonialism. The false idea of "natural slavery" was historically powerful, but its contradictions pushed humanity towards a more refined ethical system that recognized human equality[10]; to the point that we had decreased War’s rate of occurrences[11].

Even Islam as a religion itself has a development that can be historically known[12]. In the history of The Formalization of Kalām (Islamic Theology);

[9] ‘The History of the Atom – Theories and Models’, *Compound Interest*, 2016 <https://www.compoundchem.com/2016/10/13/atomicmodels/> [accessed 9 February 2025].

[10] ‘Slavery - Abolition, Resistance, Emancipation | Britannica’, 2025 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/slavery-sociology> [accessed 9 February 2025].

[11] ‘Is There Really Evidence for a Decline of War? | One Earth Future’ <https://oneearthfuture.org/en/one-earth-future/news/there-really-evidence-decline-war> [accessed 9 February 2025].

[12] Reyadh Nofan Al-Adwan, Azizi Abu Bakar, and MA Yasmin Maher El-Jamai, ‘The Origin of the Science of Ilmu Al-Kalam’, *Journal of Human Development and Communication*, 3 (2014).

The First Fitna (656–661) and Second Fitna (680–692) created theological disputes about who is a true believer and what constitutes divine justice. The Khawarij declared sinful Muslims as disbelievers (takfīr), while the Murji'ah argued that only God can judge belief. These disputes laid the groundwork for formal theology to emerge. Then, on 8th-10th Century, there's rise of Kalam and School of theology:

- Mu'tazilites (8th century):
  Advocated rationalism; emphasized God's justice & human free will.
  Asserted that Qur'an was created (not eternal).
  Supported by the Abbasid Caliph Al-Ma'mun (r. 813–833) during the Mihna (Inquisition).
- Ash'arites (9th–10th century):
  Founded by Al-Ash'ari (d. 936) as a middle path between Mu'tazilism and traditionalism.
  Affirmed occasionalism (God directly causes everything).
  Believed in acquisition (kasb)—humans have some responsibility for actions.
- Maturidites (10th century):
  Founded by Abu Mansur al-Maturidi (d. 944), similar to Ash'arism but with greater emphasis on reason.
  Became the dominant theology in Hanafi regions (Ottoman, Mughals, Central Asia).
- Hanbali/Athari Traditionalists:
  Rejected kalām; insisted on a literalist approach to Qur'an and Hadith.
  Later influenced Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 1328) and modern Salafi movements.

Then later on, on 11th-12th Century, there's the Ash'ari Consensus and the decline of Mu'talizites. Al-Ghazali's Incoherence of the Philosophers (Tahāfut al-Falāsifah) criticized excessive rationalism. Ash'arism became the dominant Sunni theological school, shaping institutions like Al-Azhar University. Mu'tazilism declined under Sunni rule but influenced later Shi'a thought (Twelver theology). Kalām then formalized Islamic theology, allowing engagement with philosophy and logic. Ash'arism and Maturidism became the Sunni orthodox position, with Hanbali theology remaining in opposition. The balance between reason and revelation continued shaping later Islamic thought.

Another example is the formalization of the Islamic Jurisprudence[13]. In the time of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), legal rulings were directly revealed through the Qur'an and clarified by the Prophet's actions (Sunnah). After his death, the Companions (Sahabah) and their successors (Tabi‘un) issued legal opinions (fatwas) based on the Qur’an, Sunnah, and personal reasoning (ijtihād). An because of a different geographic, different legal traditions emerged. In Hijaz (Mecca & Medina), the tradition emphasized Hadith (e.g., Sa‘id ibn al-Musayyib). In Iraq (Kufa & Basra) they Relied more on reason and analogy (e.g., Abu Hanifa). Then, by the 8th Century, there’s a rise in four Sunni Madzhab. By this period, legal reasoning became more systematic, and major scholars founded madhāhib (legal schools):

- Hanafi School (Abu Hanifa, d. 767) – Used qiyās (analogy) and istihsān (juridical preference) for flexibility.
- Maliki School (Malik ibn Anas, d. 795) – Based on the practices of Medina and local consensus.
- Shafi‘i School (Al-Shafi‘i, d. 820) – Formalized usul al-fiqh (principles of jurisprudence), balancing Hadith and reasoning.
- Hanbali School (Ahmad ibn Hanbal, d. 855) – Strict adherence to Hadith, minimal rationalist tools.

Then, on 9th century, Al-Shafi‘i’s Risālah (the first formal book on jurisprudence) standardized how laws should be derived. The madhāhib became structured institutions, with scholars writing commentaries and issuing legal verdicts. The Ottoman Empire (15th–19th century) later institutionalized Hanafi fiqh as the empire’s official legal system. Fiqh became systematized rather than based on individual reasoning. Taqlīd (following legal precedent) became the norm, though some scholars continued ijtihād. Over time, regional differences solidified into formal legal schools, guiding courts and scholars.

The point is, had these ‘false’ ideas doesn’t exist in the first place; had these societies didn’t took a step to progress because think that they’ll inevitably fails, we could never have a dialectics struggles that refines the structure of reality around us. These progress, although not perfect, are still progress nonetheless. It helps us to views the world more better; having a better judgement on several matter of situation; and Progressing societies as a whole. We would say the, the possibility of new knowledge is not yet closed,

[13] Wael B. Hallaq, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunni Usul Al-Fiqh* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).

as we would never have a ‘perfect system’ that is the Divine. But although The Ruler never been perfect in the first place, it is definitely getting better according to the history before us. So why would an organism should chooses to stagnate and regress when they can get better?

3.4. Interpretation of the Reference

Then one may ask, if any Ruler is as far as a best approximation, how come we can know that an interpretation is better and more aligned with the Truth compared to another one? We would try to argue that, since any of human attempts at interpreting the Reference is flawed, one cannot claim the Absolute correctness and abolish all means of critiques and dialectical struggles.

However, some interpretations are closer to the Reference than others. The challenge is how to measure this alignment while acknowledging structured incompleteness. We provide a method in which we man can measure how can we know that an interpretation is closer or not:

- Dialectical refinement – Does the interpretation evolve to address contradictions, or does it stagnate?
- Justice – Does it create a more just and ethical society? Does the interpretation more align with the need of the society and reality itself? Is it Logical?
- Freedom from illusion and power interests – Is the interpretation shaped by truth-seeking, or by worldly power (rulers, social elites, ideological rigidity)?

That is, of course, our best approximation. Now, The Reference exists independently of human rulers, scholars, or interpreters. No human authority fully embodies it. But many regimes or religious elites claim they alone represent divine truth—but this is ideological illusion. The moment an interpretation claims to be absolute, it moves away from the Reference because it denies structured incompleteness.

A just ruler or scholar must acknowledge that their interpretation is fallible and allow dialectical refinement—otherwise, they are moving away from the Reference. Once a critique is silenced, then it is a red flag that must be addressed. Truth-seeking requires structured incompleteness. If an interpretation allows critique, debate, and adaptation, it is closer to the Reference. If it claims finality and suppresses dissent, it is further. If an interpretation claims to be the final word and silences critique, it is likely

moving away from the Reference. A living truth refines itself; a dead ideology fossilizes.

The second one is, the closer an interpretation is to the Reference, the more it reduces injustice and promotes coherence. Some examples are: The Qur'an acknowledges slavery but introduces ethical mechanisms for its abolition (manumission as a virtue, gradual elimination). Some scholars emphasized freeing slaves as a Quranic goal, while others justified perpetuating slavery under political rulers. The interpretations that moved toward abolishing slavery are closer to the Reference because they reduced injustice.

The third one would be, An interpretation is suspect if it primarily benefits the ruling class, elites, or enforcers of power, rather than serving truth. When religious rulings are used to justify oppression, they often serve the ruler, not the Divine. An example would be that, many empires used scholars to declare rebellion against them as religiously forbiDDAn, even when rulers were unjust. Some theocratic states enforce religious law only on the weak (women, minorities) while elites live in excess. The more an interpretation serves the people, the ethical structure, and justice rather than rulers, the closer it is to DRP. If an interpretation conveniently aligns with the interests of those in power, it is likely an illusion. A ruler who claims "Islam requires obedience to leaders, even if they are corrupt" is twisting religion for control. The closer an interpretation is to serving universal justice rather than rulers, the closer it is to DRP.

When faced with two different religious interpretations, ask:

1. Which one allows dialectical refinement rather than claiming finality?
   If one interpretation allows ijtihād, debate, and critique, and the other silences dissent, the first is likely closer to DRP.
2. Which one produces more justice, coherence, and ethical outcomes?
   If one interpretation leads to less oppression, more dignity, and social well-being, it is closer to DRP.
3. Which one is free from political or class-based interests?
   If an interpretation primarily benefits rulers, elites, or enforcers of power, it is likely ideological rather than divine.

An example, some scholars argue that women's rights should be severely restricted, justifying it with selective Quranic interpretations. Others argue that Islamic ethics promote equity and justice, emphasizing historical context and refinement. For this situation, The interpretation that moves

toward greater justice while maintaining coherence with the ethical principles of revelation is closer to the Reference.

Since no human interpretation is fully DRP, even the best interpretations:

1. Must remain open to critique and revision.
2. Cannot claim totality—only approximation.
3. Must be evaluated not by static rules, but by their ethical and justice-producing effects.

3.5. Role of Ideology and School of Thought

- On Applied Ideologies

  Now that we know what is the definition of knowledge, and what does it serves; we can now move unto the discussion of the role of Ideologies. But first, we need to ask, what is an ideology? And how does it viewed through the lens of DDA? According to our definition of what a Knowledge is, Ideology, in this case, would then be defined as a systematized information which can serve how one should view an organism in itself and around it. It is a bunch of knowledge that constructed, in a way that it can gives an insight to human; whether about what should he do, and what will possibly exist in the future, what may be had happened in the past, and things like that. Like any form of systematization, it cannot be perfect, and would leaves a Lack in its inherent structure.

  Let’s say for example, the ideologies of Marxism which systematized a bunch of information in a way that would give someone an insight of dialectical struggles through the lens of Materialism (e.g. The alienation of the proletariat; the Capitalist oppression; how the history would possibly works; etc). In this regard, the Lack is his blindness towards the Spiritual aspect is one of the costs (or Leak of the system) that makes it vulnerable in itself; in which it would manifest in the error between the ideological prediction of reality in contrast with the true reality. This flaw of the system is not a bug, but a part of the structure itself; it is an inherent feature of the ideology itself that refuses to get totalized by the very fabric of reality; that is, a variable that’s points out something beyond its total system (e.g. spiritual; emotional; existential; etc). On Further critique of Ideology would be discussed in Axiology section.

- On School of Thought

Then it would may be asks, what's the difference between School of Thought and Ideologies? We would say that, they are the same; in a way that, they are systematized information which may give an insight to a human. However, a school of thought is more general in its application. While ideologies are applied system that's usually reserved into politics and government, we think that the School of Thought would be more general, as it is also include the system of analyzation of another school of thought and ideologies.

There are exists an ideology which admits its Lack, and tries to address it in their own way. One of an example would be Transcendental Materialism[14] by Adrian Johnston, in which although they still sees the Material as the highest reality there is, they tries to address the Lack of why rigid and traditional materialism are less accurate, and tries to fix it by whatever options they are provided with. Another one would be a Žižekian[15] system, where this ideology tries to uncover any layer of illusion of a 'perfect system' by maintaining its contradiction and makes an alienation within the system. More precisely, this system itself is one of the inspirations of the work of DDA, but with aDDAd directional movement instead of a meaningless struggle of dialectics.

So, what has DDA says about these systems of thought? We will say that, although it is an incomplete and partial truth, and even if their framework are contradicting our very views about the Existence of the Divine, one cannot reject the insight that they had provide to the human progress. DDA supports to all systems of critique and insight, both from theological framework, or secular. That is, including Marxism, Zizekian, Transcendental Materialism, and any other secular views. That is because again, like what we had said before, the Reference is axiomatic and cannot be quantified.

So in this regard, as incomplete as it is, every means or tools of critique and analysis of problems, contradiction, and insight of progress, are required nonetheless; in spite of whether there'll be a difference in their core fundamental framework, such as the tension between Theism and Secularism. A Different Ruler is required for different measurements, especially when the Reference cannot be contained within just one Ruler.

[14] Adrian Johnston, *Adventures in Transcendental Materialism: Dialogues with Contemporary Thinkers* (Edinburgh University Press, 2014).

[15] Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (Verso, 1989).

> This is why in DDA, it is justified, for example, for a theist to use Marxism to analyze contradiction and within a system to resolve it with something better in the future; despite their inherent incompatibility of ontological framework. But, we emphasizes that it cannot be a justification for an organism to apply only one system of thought with a totality, as it remains inherently lacking in principle. So what we propose is a perpetual progress with different tools (i.e. system of thought and critique) for analysis of different problems and resolution. We want to reach a state where a society is not complete or total in itself, but rather, develops into something better and stronger as they progress through history. The same can be said with perpetual self-development, and perpetual learning and growth.

3.4. Regulating the Access of Knowledge

A question would be asks, if knowledge is neutral, why bother regulating it? Shouldn't people deserve to receives Knowledge? Yes, but it must within the right way. For example, a knowledge of how to create a firearm must be handled responsibly (e.g. to specialist), and cannot be accessed by an immature because it will lead to potential unrest. A Knowledge is neutral—it is not inherently good or bad. Its value is determined by how it is applied and whether it aligns with the Reference. So in this regard, a knowledge it's not regulated because of its very nature, but rather in accordance of the maturity of a society. A specialist can access an information, so that it leads the society into further progress.

Knowledge should not be regulated arbitrarily but should be assessed based on whether its unrestricted use creates more justice, coherence, and ethical stability—bringing society closer to the Reference. The regulation of knowledge should function as stewardship, ensuring it is used for progress rather than suppression or reckless exploitation. It should not be decided by one body of power, but multiple; and it cannot be used to justify the suppression of information and knowledge without consent.

Systems closest to *the Reference* at a given time should regulate access but remain open to critique. Who are the specialist on certain matters, to decide whether an information is beneficial to the society or not; according to their maturity. It cannot be a single entity: that is because, there's a different tools and specialist for different cases of knowledge. People that know what is the danger of an ideology of fascism, for example, should decide what and how to mitigate its risk; a weapon maker should regulate that their

information on how to create a bomb are not to be given in the societies or individual that is underqualified in his ethics and knowledge to manage such thing.
A problem arises, in example, when a political leader that's an expert on exploring the politics; that was chosen to rule, decide on things that they know less about. It will be dangerous if a revolutionist politician, to decide that all knowledge should be accessible: and then do so in a reckless manner that's further causing distress among masses. One then, should receive critique properly to address what is lacking in another, to have better judgement over certain matters. A self-regulating network of experts, combined with critique from relevant scholars and ethical oversight, should prevent knowledge monopolization while maintaining ethical safeguards. But we want to further emphasize that a knowledge in the form of analyzation and critique, should never be suppressed, as like Marxism in Theocratic government, or religion in Totalitarian Secular state.

4. Axiology: Ethics & The Direction of Reference

4.1. Divine Reference as the Ontological & Moral Imperative

Ethical progress is an asymptotic function of aligning with *the Reference*. While no system is absolute, relative proximity can be evaluated. The Reference must be striven towards; else, the consequences of stagnation and regress will influence not just an individual, but also their environment and therefore the whole system itself. We would then try to explain on why that is the case, by proving:

1. What is a desire and why it won't be fulfilled;
2. What is a transgression and what impact it had on organism as well as its environment;
3. What options do we have and why it differs;

We would then be discussing 2 concept, that is, Object petit 'a', and Jouissance; and tries to decide what relationship do they have in regards to an organism and its surrounding environment.

- Object petit 'a'

Objet petit ‘a’[16] function as a symbolic approximation of *the Reference*, perpetually out of reach but structuring ethical desire and epistemic striving. It is the cause of desire, not its object. In mysticism, God or the divine is often the ultimate unattainable—the infinite that always exceeds human grasp. This is what the Lack manifest into the human existence: The Lack and Longing from the Full Divine Experience causes one to desire eternally, without ever fulfils it in any meaningful way— that is, in exception for the Mystics; but we will delve into that later, as we’ll now examine the role of the Object petit ‘a’.

It is a Cause, not a goal unlike ordinary object that fulfils a need (e.g. food for hunger), this is more than what sustains the desire itself rather than satisfying it. Once a distractive object is attained, the desire shifts elsewhere, maintaining the feeling of lack. He connects it to Freud’s idea that human desire is shaped by an early, lost object; a pre-symbolic unity with the mother. In DDA however, we would interpret this as a pre-symbolic unity with the Divine that is full. Because of this original unity is gone when one acquires his Ego and are limited by Symbol, the Real becomes unreachable, and all later desire are substitutes, attempting to recover what was lost, but never succeeding.

Human then, attempting to reconciliate it, create a fantasies around it. The way that it does is that a man will lie to himself about what it is, rather than addressing it in a meaningful way. This Object, won’t be satisfied in any rational attempt, in one way or another. In the capitalism, it is ‘I may feel fulfilled if I bought the right products’ then manifested around the culture of consumerism. In Totalitarian Theocratic government I is that ‘I may feel unfulfilled because I didn’t pray more’, leading to excessive symbolic struggles, an excessive pray without struggles to hope that the problems ‘magically’ remove itself, that it leads the subject nowhere instead of addressing the real problem, causing further stagnation and regression within the subject. The point is, it is the gap between what’s Real and what we thought is Real, manifested in an object of desire that will never be fulfilled when the ego (Nafs) clings to itself. Sometimes, when someone’s desire are remains as an excess even with the means of available pleasure that’s allowed by the symbol, it would manifest into a Jouissance, a kind of a strange pleasure.

- Jouissance

[16] Object Petit a on Page 6

We would then, tries to explain what do we know about it. In everyday experience, pleasure often refers to something that can be fully consumed or satisfied—eating when hungry, sleeping when tired, etc. However, jouissance goes beyond that. It's a kind of pleasure that cannot be fully consumed, a desire that’s always excessive. It’s not just about achieving something pleasurable; it’s about going beyond that pleasure to experience something more—something that exceeds what is normally felt or allowed. This excess is what makes jouissance so distinct from normal pleasure—it’s not just about feeling good, but feeling something more than what can be contained or fully experienced in a socially acceptable way.

In Lacan’s terms, the excessiveness of jouissance is connected to transgression—the experience of pleasure that arises when we go beyond the normal boundaries of what is permissible, whether in terms of social norms, personal limitations, or even the structure of desire itself. It’s the kind of pleasure that’s tied to pushing the boundaries of what's socially or ethically allowed, even if it causes discomfort or harm.

In Lacanian theory, is also linked to the Real—that which is beyond language, representation, or symbolization. The Real is what is unrepresentable, the part of human experience that exceeds our capacity to articulate or make sense of it. Jouissance taps into this excess, in the sense that it’s a form of pleasure that can't be fully captured by our usual symbolic systems. It’s not something that can be easily described or integrated into our social norms—it’s something that resists full comprehension and cannot be neatly contained within the structures of language or society.

This excess is what gives jouissance its disruptive quality. It’s the part of experience that overflows the symbolic order, which is why it’s so unsettling. Jouissance makes us encounter the Real, the limit of our symbolic understanding, and this encounter is intense and often destabilizing. We may experience jouissance when we confront moments of the Real—such as intense, overwhelming experiences (trauma, profound desire, or ecstatic moments)—and it’s these moments where pleasure becomes excessive, beyond the symbolic realm of normal experience. It is a reminder that there is something inherently lack in ourselves, and that may strengthen the idea that maybe even progress itself, is meaningless.

We would interpret that, the rate of occurrence for Jouissance, is corelated with the gap between the Symbol and the Real. The closer the distance between them, the more stable it is and controllable—but not to the point of diminish it entirely, but asymptotically. It would then, also be true for the opposites: the more distance grew between them, the more unstable and intense it is. It won't never be fulfilled for a human, except in one case where that'll be put into a different section.

- The Big Other

Before we delve into how would a Jouissance in the real world, we would want to remind ourselves about the Big Other. The Big Other, is an unseen authority that structures meaning, law, and social expectation. It is not a real thing (e.g. Police; Law Enforcer) but rather an abstract force —God, the State, the Marker, Morality, the Party, etc. Now why would this be relevant to the Jouissance? Well, since a Jouissance is when an excess desire when a subject is unsatisfied with the common means of pleasure; a Jouissance will manifest into something else. We did explore how it can affect an organism, and how did it happen. A Jouissance, is a necessity for its subject, to withheld a coherence of his illusion of a complete system from the Big Other; to put blame not on the illusion they've believing in, but to put a finger on a scapegoat—whether abstract or real; so that their belief and illusion of coherence remains intact. It is an excess desire, that makes its subject wanting to have an illusion that things are fine, and that their live has meaning in one way or another. It is a necessity for One to withhold their worldview so that it remains intact. We will see how it would manifest into the real world:

1. Jouissance in Submission to the Big Other

   Submission to the Big Other provides a false sense of stability, as it shifts responsibility from the self to an external authority. This shields individuals from confronting their own contradictions. If an Authority dictates morality, then there's no need for personal reflection to see what is wrong with themselves. It saves them from actually confronting the void in themselves with a false reassurement they put on themselves, that 'the System will fix this' or 'God will eventually correct all of this'. They put Hope on the Big Other so that the void they have in themselves remains covered; so that the subject won't

have their worldview shatters and face their uncanny Lack from themselves.

It would results, for example, in Religious Societies, that a subject would derive pleasure from following a religious law, often excessively —not because out of fear, but because it makes them feel pure, elevated, or chosen. It put blames on something else: The Heretics that God will soon punish them magically. Even when they are suffering, they derive pleasure from it: ‘The harder the struggle, the more God would rewards me’.

Another example would be, in Capitalist Societies, where a subject becomes more productive, and results in workaholism. People in this case, take pride in their self-exploitation, working overtime as a badge of their honor. It put blames of their Lack into ‘the people who won’t hard harder’. They will cover their void with an illusion that their problem, comes from the parasites of societies that is, doesn’t work harder and yet causing problem and taking advantage of people like them. It is the same as in religious community, that it will makes them feel elevated. In their illusion of ‘hard work=success’, they derive pleasure from it; gladly taking their suffering and makes them feel good about themselves.

But Submission to the Big Other is a false comfort—true Justice comes from facing the void, and strive towards it; not a blind obedience to the system that is flawed and act like an idol, but asymptotic refinement of themselves towards the Reference.

2. Jouissance in Guilt to Transgress the Big Other

Oddly enough, Transgression from the Big Other can also become pleasurable to a subject, but only when the Big Other remains intact—sinning and repenting reinforce the system rather than dismantling it. The Guilt itself becomes a form of enjoyment—one ‘sins’ while knowing its wrong; but precisely because it is forbiDDAn, it feels more pleasurable. A kind of a guilty pleasure that’s taken voluntarily to maintains the authority of the Big Other. This would explain why some people cling to a morality they secretly violate—the contradiction itself sustains their pleasure. In this case, they strengthen their illusion by stating that ‘the reason why I feel like this, is because I don’t follow the rule’. The subject points their finger in themselves, in

return for covering the void in themselves. It is a pleasure, in which it would strengthen his belief of ‘why I feel like this; I must be an error; or things like that. So, in cost of blaming themselves, they had covered their illusion of the rightness of The Big Other; strengthening their believes and maintains their worldview.

A believer feels tormented by sinful thoughts, but enjoys the struggle of ‘resisting temptation; the poor people are also tormented by them that they may transgress ethical norms, but enjoy their struggles in that process of ‘trying to be good but fails’. They unconsciously allow themselves to transgress it, so that their worldview would remain intact. Their identity depends on guilt—without it, their believe would collapse. The Jouissance is not in the sinning, but in the endless cycle of sinning and repenting. The guilt is what distract themselves in addressing the void.

An example would be the Moral Hypocrisy of the Elites. The Ultra-rich preach environmentalism, ethics, and philanthropy while living in excess; disregarding the poor. The contradiction is not an accident (i.e, enjoying luxury while pretending to care about justice).

True justice is not about external purity, but about moving dialectically toward ethical coherence, rather than indulging in cycles of repression and guilt.

3. Jouissance in Enforcing the Big Other

Policing others provides a substitute for genuine ethical striving, as it grants power without requiring self-examination. The enforcer is trapped in the same system but takes pleasure in their power over others. This is why people defend systems that oppress them—it gives them status, purpose, or meaning.

For example, the ‘Moral Police’ in Authoritarian Regimes. A poor, struggling worker becomes a government informant, snitching on neighbours to prove their loyalty. They do not benefit materially—but enjoy the feeling of being the arm of authority. The act of policing others becomes their Jouissance—even though they remain exploited.

Another example would be a Cancel Culture and Online Mob Justice. Some activist gain pleasure from destroying reputations in the name

of ‘justice’. Instead of seeking systemic change, they focus on personal punishment, taking pleasure in ‘exposing’ others. The Jouissance comes from power—not justice.

True justice is not about policing others for status, but about real systemic refinements towards the Reference. Those who enforce morality often does so for pleasure, not truth.

4. Jouissance in Certainty in the Big Other

People cling to the Big Other because it provides the illusion of coherence—even when reality contradicts it. When the Big Other is threatened, individuals react not to defend truth, but to preserve the illusion that shields them from uncertainty. If the Big Other collapses, their entire sense of reality collapses.

A person may clings to conspiracy theories even when disproven—because the illusion gives them comfort. They derive pleasure from ‘knowing the truth’ that others are ‘too blind to see’. Jouissance comes from the feeling of certainty, not truth itself.

An example would be Nationalism and the Myth of a Glorious Past. Many cling to national myths (e.g., “We were once a great empire!”) even when historical evidence suggests otherwise. The pleasure is not in historical truth, but in the emotional comfort of believing in it.

True Progress requires letting go of illusions and accepting structured incompleteness—false certainty leads to stagnation.

True ethical progress requires confronting the structured incompleteness of all systems. Instead of deriving pleasure from submission, transgression, or enforcement, one must engage in a dialectical movement toward the Reference—where meaning is not imposed, but continually rediscovered.

- Resolve

That being said, is there a way to fix this problem of unfulfillment? The writer would argue that only way to fix these, is by 2 possible choices: one, for the layperson the acknowledgement of the Lack and striving towards the Reference— even though they know that they would never

arrive at finality; and two, for those who had nothing to lose, self-annihilation and asceticism of the mystics provide the possibility of experiencing the Divine without symbols—a fulfilment of a desire by Real experience.

Then it would be argued that, if this Object of desire is remains unfulfilled, why then we had to strive towards the Real anyway? It is a basically meaningless struggle! Then we would say that, it is not.

While the object of desire would remain unfulfilled, the Gap between the humans and the Reference are asymptotic, there's a gap between the Symbol, Ego, and the Real, it is still meaningful. The reason is, the closer we get to the Real, the more stable a subject is. The more of the gap between the Real and the symbol becomes ever-diminishing, the more of the object desire becomes less and less relevant. This leads to ever-diminishing Jouissance's rate of occurrence—even if it asymptotic.

The closer we move toward the Reference, the more stable and fulfilled we become. This pursuit is a pleasure in itself: a continuous and everlasting growth without absolute finality, where each moment of progress brings deeper satisfaction. It is a pleasure to know that one is striving toward something meaningful, that one is better than they once believed—through their own conscious choices. And beyond that, the knowledge that one can always become even better, forever, by choosing to grow. A finite freedom within an infinite field of possibilities. Rather than Sisyphus endlessly pushing a boulder up a mountain with a fixed peak, he would be far more happier knowing that there is no final limit—only continuous ascent shaped by his own choices. The peak will never trap him, nor will he regress; he moves forward, forever growing, ever been better, ever been higher.

Then what if someone just decide to not participate? Just be stagnant, and accepts that this will be everything that is? In that regard, we will explore the Ethical Stagnation in the next section.

- Ethical Stagnation

Ethical stagnation occurs when object petit 'a' becomes fixated within an ideological totality rather than being sublimated toward the the Reference. In simpler terms, this means that instead of directly confronting a fundamental lack or contradiction in their existence, a

subject displaces their problem onto an external illusion—something that provides a temporary sense of coherence but ultimately sustains their entrapment.

This illusion can take many forms:

- The belief that one's suffering is caused by an external 'enemy' rather than an internal contradiction.
- The belief that attaining a specific object (money, success, spiritual piety, etc.) will finally resolve their dissatisfaction.
- The belief that adhering to a fixed ideological system will provide complete meaning and security.

The presence of an 'enemy' or an object of desire is not necessarily bad in itself. Rather, these illusions serve a crucial function: they sustain a subject's worldview and allow them to maintain ideological coherence despite accumulating contradictions. Ideology, in this sense, operates as if it provides answers to all questions—it presents itself as a closed system in which everything fits neatly into place. However, this is an illusion. The structure is inherently incomplete, but the subject perceives it as whole in order to preserve their psychological stability.

To maintain this illusion, the subject externalizes their problem, shifting responsibility onto something beyond themselves. This displacement can take the form of a 'ghost' (an abstract enemy, a conspiracy, an oppressive force) or a 'material object' (wealth, status, ritual practice). In either case, the subject clings to the belief that "things will get better if situation X happens," where X is an illusory promise (e.g., getting a job, praying more, achieving success).

- The Consequences of Ethical Stagnation

The Real problem does not disappear simply because it is covered up. Instead, contradictions continue to accumulate within the closed system. As we have seen, a closed system would either:

(1) Generates endless new questions, leading to a cycle of rationalization and infinite regress.

(2) Becomes rigid and dogmatic, rejecting all ‘dangerous’ information that threatens the illusion. ‘because I said so’ argument.

As contradictions accumulate, the subject may attempts to resolve them by constructing new narratives that sustain the illusion. The cycle might look something like this:

“Why don’t I feel happy? Because I don’t have money.”

“Why am I still unhappy even after making money? Because there’s something else I need to buy.”

“Why do I still feel empty? Because… because…”

This process leads to two major consequences:

- Increased alienation from the Reference – The subject becomes further entrenched in illusion, moving away from true ethical and existential alignment.

- Heightened Jouissance – Because the subject unconsciously recognizes the failure of their illusion, they compensate through excessive enjoyment (Jouissance). This can manifest as compulsive behavior, self-destructive pleasure, or parasitic tendencies within their environment.

Thus, ethical stagnation either leads to total ideological closure or a breaking point—a rupture.

- Rupture: Two Possible Outcomes

At a certain threshold, the subject would then no longer be able to sustain the illusion. The contradictions become overwhelming, and the subject is forced to confront the Real. This moment of rupture leads to two possible outcomes:

Revolutionary Reform (Constructive Rupture) – The subject recognizes the fundamental lack they had been avoiding and reconstructs their worldview in a way that is more aligned with the Real. This does not

mean achieving total coherence but rather accepting the impossibility of a closed system. A new ideology is born—one that remains open to contradiction and change.

Deeper Regression (Destructive Rupture) – Instead of confronting the Real, the subject reinforces their illusion, becoming more dogmatic and closed off. This intensifies their alienation, increases their reliance on Jouissance, and ultimately leads to an existential crisis that will eventually force another confrontation with the Real.

Thus, rupture is inevitable—it is only a matter of how the subject chooses to respond when it occurs. So, the choices would be asymptotic progression or regression.

4.2. Individual Implication

It is a moral imperative that a man should progress; not just for himself, but also for the environment they're occupies. This 'obligation', would not occurs in a direct punishment (i.e. Police or Law enforcer), but rather an existential one. It's not that the case if someone that face further away from the Reference would become punished by a real entity, but it's the as same as if someone knows that a poison is a poison, but they keep drinking it nonetheless; One then cannot complain that the poison makes them sick, because the subject has chosen to drink it—just as one who clings to ideological illusion cannot complain when it collapses under its own contradictions; and the consequences of the choice they took is merely a symptom of reality.

If then one would seek into stagnation, it's only a matter time for them before they were forced to choose again; and we can see which option is better and leads to more coherence and stability.

If one then would seek self-annihilation, it would be supported by DDA—so long as this is a dissolution of the ego into divine reality, not mere escapism or rejection of existence. But we do recognize that it is not an option for everyone. Thus, for the layperson alike, an asymptotic progress towards more coherence, more epistemic and ethical progress, is not merely a good choice—it is the most natural alignment with reality itself.

4.3. Political Implications

- DDA's Zizekian Critique of an Ideology

- Ethical stagnation leads to systemic contradiction and potential collapse.
- DDA rejects static utopianism in favor of perpetual critique and refinement.
- Political systems should be judged by their adaptability and commitment to *the Reference*.

4.4. Universal Obligation to Ethical Progress

Recognizing *the Reference* necessitates striving toward ethical improvement, avoiding both fundamentalist rigidity and relativistic apathy.

5. Mathematical Model for Ethical Progress

Ethical trajectories can be modeled asymptotically:

5.1. Ethical Progress Function

$$E(t) = DRP - \frac{C}{e^{kt}}$$

where:

- $E(t)$ represents ethical progress at time t.
- DRP is the ultimate divine ethical standard.
- k is the rate of ethical refinement.
- C is an initial condition capturing ideological inertia.

5.2. Ethical Proximity Index (EPI)

A composite measure of ethical progress:

$$EPI = w_1 J + w_2 D + w_3 H + w_4 I$$

where:

- J = social justice (rights, economic equity).
- D = dialectical adaptability (critique, reform).
- H = human flourishing (health, literacy, sustainability).
- I = institutional integrity (governance, ethics).
- w values adjust based on historical necessity.

5.3. Divine Volition & Dialectical Occasionalism

- Divine intervention occurs probabilistically rather than deterministically.
- Stochastic occasionalism introduces non-linear ruptures in ethical progress.
- This prevents stagnation but maintains divine immanence.

5. Converting Zizek into a Theist

- On the case of Pharoh and Totalitarian Secularism

  He had claimed that he himself is a God, and God has punished him and preserve his bodies and story as a lesson.

- On the Case of Israelites and Theocratic Absolutism

  They had claimed that they follow God, yet they act like they have better views on regards to reality and the Divine; worshipping an external masculine instead of something which resides in feminine position, that is Beyond the Logic itself. The story of how the very group of People that has recognized the Divine would still clings into the something in masculine position instead of addressing and facing the Truth. They also had delude themselves thinking that they are God; but instead voicing that they only follows the ‘divine’, interpreting and hiding His verses as they like and act as if they are the representation of the divine.

- On Critique of Closed-system of Ideologies

  On the realm of governance, the Jouissance may would explains why some countries, despite the rule that they said they would uphold, still transgress itself by resorting in much oppression towards something ‘just for the masses to get distracted’; our interpretation of it is that it would do so to protect the image of a perfect system while covering the real problem; further causing alienation of a system and its subject. The more people are alienated by an oppressive system, the more they seek extreme pleasure as an escape (crime, substance abuse, political rebellion, etc.). So it is a system of repeating feedback between the States, and the individual. Individual transgress, it influence the state; the state tries to cover its real problem by further transgression towards its subject, and on and on.

The more an oppression and alienation that happens within a system; or the more of contradiction of an organism would have in himself; the more they'll transgress the law or the moral that's labelled into them. That is because, the system doesn't provide a sufficient amount of means of pleasure, while the self, with an ever growing problems and desire to get rid of that problem, would escape into transgression as a means of 'just to feel something'. In an attempt to satisfy that excess desire, oftentimes an individual would feel guilty and more desperate afterwards.

Governments may deliberately produce controlled jouissance to distract the masses. A dictatorship might allow nationalistic violence, excessive moral policing, or public executions as state-sanctioned jouissance—giving people an outlet for excess energy while keeping real systemic contradictions hiDDAn. The government uses its contradiction to oppress more people, to give them a distraction for its own flaws; to avoids that its incompleteness is exposed, claiming that it is natural and not a flaw in a system. It's critique on government and ideology, will discussed much further in the next section.

Let's take a look on how would ideology works on the real world. For example between Nordic countries and Totalitarian Socialist countries, the USSR. Marx predicted that a progress of history would be determined by the material condition, a class struggle which will absolve feudalism and give birth to Capitalism, and then the class struggle will occur again in Capitalism, and give birth to Socialism in violent revolt. He takes an account on materialist aspect in cost of other uncalculated aspect (not-All). Therefore, it has a flaw. This flaw, then manifested into error of prediction, as then occurs the case of the Nordic states, while feudalistic, would prove that progress would occur into Democracy, even without violent revolt and excessive capitalist crisis. This system, although old, still survives until this day, preceding the collapse of the materialist totalitarian USSR system that's stagnant and refuses to admit its contradiction and uncalculated aspect within the system; making the problems accumulate and therefore their inevitable collapse.

Another example would be that a contradiction which Marx misses are the human psyche in Materialist lens. Marx predicted that the struggles of history is purely Material and deterministic, yet, when faced with the case of Neo-Liberal Capitalist societies, it fails to account an individual, while despite their freedom, are still feeling alienated in their self, as their system tries to hides its own contradiction by presenting itself as a

final stage, and therefore any reform of the System wouldn't be necessary; or even heretical in some case. As a results, as Byung-Chul Han puts it; the spreading malaise occurs as an inability to manage negative experiences in an age characterized by excessive positivity and the universal availability of people and goods . Despite their freedom and abundance of Material, people decide to slave themselves away to 'fill that hole in self', accumulating contradiction as well as increasing Jouissance's rate of occurrence through workaholic approach, drug abuses, and any other form of transgression.

According to DDA, this is a result when stagnation occurs in a long run; contradiction accumulates, and it will eventually force an individual or society to develops into one of two possible states, that is, Regress through further elimination and Illusionment of the Real, or the Reference in this sense; or Progress through acknowledgement of the real problem, to the Reference, to the 'what should be right instead of this', and resolution of the contradiction. This is why, Marx himself rejected the idea of Utopian Socialism which will tries to brings into reality, a 'heaven on earth' where it is impossible in the first place; instead, he proposes scientific socialism where his theories can be analyzed and reformed as societies would need it. But he fails to account the need of Meta-narration that would explains why progress and direction even exist at all.

Same can be said with the case of Totalitarian Theocratic government. Although using the Divine as their justification instead of the Material, there's still an oppression within the system. In this case, let's take a look of an example of Post-Rashidun Theo-Monarch government, the Ummayad. While they came from the Ideal State of the prophethood and guided companions, the next generation of Ruler implement a totalitarian Government that's refuses to adapt and reform its system: claiming that 'we had already Found the Truth, we just have to Obey it'. In a part, they are right that Truth exists, but what do they miss, is that they mistaken the idea of True Justice with a justice that has been modified and systematized by the flawed bureaucrats. In return, there's a Lack that removes to be totalized, and then they would become blind with it. In return for claiming the truth, they work on a societal oppression towards non-believers and putting a burden of tax on them; limiting their right as a human by labelling them as a 'lower caste' and also fight against those who tries to reform the system by claiming that "it is heretical to change a system that has been decreed by God!' In a

sense that, they had claimed that the Divine are already been totalized into a system, fantasizes that the system are already perfect, while also continuously act upon its contradiction and oppression. They had mistaken God as themselves rather than the True God.

To know that any system we had created is flawed, and that it won't capture the True Reference, is a responsibility and a wisdom, according to us.

- Where do we differ from Zizek?

6. On Regards with Mysticism and Sufism

We held the explanation regarding Sufism at the very end because, it is necessary for the reader to understand a few key concept and how would those concepts works. We now will tries to explains the existence of Sufism and Divine's volition in regards to asymbolic Mystical Experience of the Divine.

Mystical experience provides glimpses of the Reference but remains incommunicable within symbolic systems. Mystics describe their longing for God in a way that mirrors Lacan's never-ending desire, where divine union is sought but never fully possessed.

Mystics bypass the Symbolic and momentarily experience the Real (Divine Fullness), but this is not stable nor permanent—hence the need for extreme asceticism and annihilation of the self (fanā'). They are the only ones who momentarily dissolve the Lack, but because they must abandon Ego and Symbol, their experience is not communicable in normal human terms. They are the living proof of why a reality is more than a symbol and that human comprehension is Lacking.

7. Conclusion: Perpetual Critique & Refinement

Divine Dialectical Emanationism (DDA) proposes that reality, knowledge, and ethics are inherently incomplete but move asymptotically toward divine justice. No system—whether theological, ideological, or scientific—can fully encapsulate truth, yet human history is structured by a constant dialectical process of refinement. Progress is not linear, nor does it reach a final

destination, but contradictions within any given system force either movement toward justice or regression into decay.

At the heart of DDA is the idea that God is both transcendent and immanent—beyond human comprehension yet actively shaping reality. This rejects both deterministic theology, which reduces God to mechanical necessity, and relativism, which denies an absolute moral direction. The the Reference functions as an unreachable yet structuring ideal, guiding ethical and epistemic progress. The closer a society or individual moves toward it, the more stable and just their system becomes; the further they regress, the more contradictions accumulate, leading to collapse.

Rather than advocating a fixed utopian model, DDA emphasizes perpetual critique and refinement. Ethical progress is not about imposing rigid doctrine but about reducing contradictions within a system, aligning it more closely with divine justice. Through a synthesis of Islamic metaphysics, dialectical reasoning, and psychoanalytic critique, DDA offers a model where faith and reason coexist, bound by the understanding that ultimate truth remains beyond reach, yet striving toward it remains the highest imperative.

DDA offers a framework that rejects both static theological absolutism and nihilistic relativism. By modeling reality as structured incompleteness with directional ethical movement, it allows for perpetual refinement of political, epistemic, and ethical systems. The only imperative is continuous asymptotic progress toward *the Reference*—an endeavor both theological and dialectical in nature.

Bibliography

Al-Adwan, Reyadh Nofan, Azizi Abu Bakar, and MA Yasmin Maher El-Jamai, ‘The Origin of the Science of Ilmu Al-Kalam’, *Journal of Human Development and Communication*, 3 (2014)

Franks, Paul W., *All Or Nothing: Systematicity, Transcendental Arguments, and Skepticism in German Idealism* (Harvard University Press, 2005)

Ghazzali, 1058-1111, *The Confessions of Al Ghazzali*, ed. by L. (Launcelot) Cranmer-Byng and S. A. (Shaporji Aspaniarji) Kapadia, trans. by Claud Field, 2019 <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/58977> [accessed 8 February 2025]

Hallaq, Wael B., *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunni Usul Al-Fiqh* (Cambridge University Press, 1997)

'How Gödel's Proof Works | Quanta Magazine' <https://www.quantamagazine.org/how-godels-proof-works-20200714/?utm_source=chatgpt.com> [accessed 8 February 2025]

'Is There Really Evidence for a Decline of War? | One Earth Future' <https://oneearthfuture.org/en/one-earth-future/news/there-really-evidence-decline-war> [accessed 9 February 2025]

Johnston, Adrian, *Adventures in Transcendental Materialism: Dialogues with Contemporary Thinkers* (Edinburgh University Press, 2014)

Lacan, Jacques, 'The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book XX: Encore: 1972-1973.', 2011

Marmura, Michael E., *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* (Brigham Young University, 1998)

Rueter, Sondra, 'The Critique of Pure Reason by Immanuel Kant: A Comprehensive Overview', *Philosophos.Org* <https://www.philosophos.org/modern-texts-the-critique-of-pure-reason-by-immanuel-kant> [accessed 8 February 2025]

'Slavery - Abolition, Resistance, Emancipation | Britannica', 2025 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/slavery-sociology> [accessed 9 February 2025]

'The History of the Atom – Theories and Models', *Compound Interest*, 2016 <https://www.compoundchem.com/2016/10/13/atomicmodels/> [accessed 9 February 2025]

Žižek, Slavoj, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (Verso, 1989)